The shyster in Posner was overt when he was faced with criticism on the computer ~~new works~~ networks. Knowing from then that one man had been denied access because another had threatened to file a libel action againt him, Posner headed ~~one of~~ his ~~responses~~ "POSNER WARNS OF LIBEL." His October 17, 1993 threat ~~was sandwiched between trips of about 10 days ech from what he said~~.

He began by characterizing criticism by David Scheim as "misleading and potentially actionable." Scheim is the author of Contract on America: The Mafia Murder of President John F. Kennedy. (New Tork, Shapolsky Publishers, 1988)

Note the "potentially." What Scheim said is or is not actionable to a lawyer, which at least by education Posner is.

In the next paragrpah, he serves "notice" ~~"note"~~ that he is turning what Scheim said over not to his lawyer but to "independent counsel." Independent hell! If Posner is going to ~~anyt~~ anything, as he is not silly enough to do, he will have his own and very partisan lawyer. There is no "independent counsel" in a lawsuit.

He then qualifies what he says in inferring libel, "to determine whether his (Scheim's) inflamatory language that characterizes my work as 'journalistic fraud' and/or 'journalistic miscomduct' constitutes libel." Again, ~~Agaunm~~ he does not say that it is libel ~~does and lay lay himself open.~~" His next statement that is meaningless except as a threat to others is "I shall not allow someone like Mr. Scheim...to damage my professional reputation with his actionable language."

There he does say that what Scheim said is actionable. But there is no word of his filing any suit against Scheim or his publisher.

Next he pontificates, with language he does not in practise follow, "It is the duty of good researchers to carefully examine a person's credibility across the board. ...I have carefully examined each of the nearly 200 persons I interviewed, and cross-checked the information I received against available documents ~~xxx~~ ...I never printed something just because someone told me. I omitted (what) I did not consider... absolutely reliable. In the final analysis the reader must trust my professional analysis and reading of the witnesses I have interviewed, and the material I include..."

2

What a bald-faced liar! As we have seen.

There are no more "available documents" that he had free access to here. Did he "cross-check" or do any kind of checking with that weird collection of zanies of the extreme of the far right, like Bringuier and Badeaux? Did he check what he took and presented as his own work the faulted work of Failure Analysis with the records I have, he knew I have, and include the official testiing of the ballistics evidence or anything else, more than enough illustrations of which are in this book?

As from his law school alone Posner should know - and he has no other real experience in the law other than as a clerk working on discovery material - for him to be able to allege malice? As a "punlic figure" he must show "malice." To sue. He makes no showing of malice against Scheim's criticisms.

And then there is what non-lawyers generally are not aware of, in seeking damages he has to submit to examination of his reputation. He will be ruined by seeking damages, as this book also makes only too clear, with his reputation damaged.

The reputation Posner made for himself in this indecency of his commercializing and exploiting the assassination is one that cannot be damaged more than he has himself damaged it.

So, even if he had been libelled, which he had not been and he is careful not to allgge that he had been, how much can he and his lawyer hope to collect with the public spectacle he has made of his intended, omnipresent dishonesty in his misttiled, scandalous book?

What he undertook to do in his threat is intimidate others against criticizing him and to mislead those who were impressed by his book and did not know enough about the subject matter to recognizei it for the atrocity it is into believing that they can trust him, depend on his word.

As he allows himself to get carried away with himself he says that "hundreds of researchers " have attempted to and failed" to find flaws in the book," and that no critics have "attacked" it and "invalidated the core of my book."

He adds that arguments against it are "silly."

The reader~~-~~s and history - are now in a position to judge even if they had no access to the many valid criticisms of him of which he certainly knew, criticism that were published, some addressed to him.

His concluding threat is carefully "iffed." It is that "I... certainly will do everything in my power to validate my legal rights~~if~~ if (emphasis added) they have been trampled on...."

Going back to ~~that malarky~~ Posner's malarky about his conscientious "cross-checking" and all that other baloney about his allaged diligence in publishing only what is "absolutely reliable," I remind the reader again that before reading ~~the~~ his book, having been told that what he says about me is without any sourcing, I wrote him on August 27 asking him for those sources he doesn not give, disputing what he attribited to me and asking the source for that and asking him why he did not include Oswald in New Orleans in his bibliography. I told him that what he used from it to criticize me is uniquely from it.

Elsewhere I address his lies in public about this when he was asked the same question, why does he not include Oswald in New Orleans in his bibliography when he uses from it what appared in it alone.

He was questioned about his accuracy, accuracy at the very least, on August 27 and he has yet to respond. ~~But~~ Yet he says he has not been questioned.

~~By ~~But~~ he~~ This is the man who says the reader "must trust" him.

Trusting him is like anesthaesthing all the chickens and then putting him ~~xxxxx~~ inside the chickenhouse.